P.F. 1 of 96

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1895-96
~~192~~...
(Last Year)

File No. 1 of 15

Serial Nos. 1 to 16

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 16.

Major ~~Part~~ B for March 1898

SUBJECT.

Appointment of Veterinary and Sub-Assistant Surgeons in charge of Civil Veterinary Hospitals, Dispensaries, &c.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Appeal No 154 of 1895-96.

Appellant (Plff.)
Venkalappa.

Respondents (Defts.)
Subrayappa.

—

Appeal No 172 of 1895-96.

Appellant:
Subrayappa

Respondent:
Venkalappa.

—

Dispute regarding the Shanbhogi of Khaji Kallahalli in the Malur Taluk.

—

List of papers in English.

(1) Assistant-Commr's judgment
(2) Deputy-Commr's decree
(3) do judgment
(4) Venkalappa's appeal petition
(5) Offl Memorandum
(6) Deputy-Commr's docket
(7) Subrayappa's appeal petition (abstract)

P T O

This suit is clearly barred
The DW was, by his own
admission born on [illegible]
the 22nd March 1867. He w
21 on the 22nd March 18
He was prosecuting his
claim from 23rd Aug. 1888 to
6th May 1891 or during
a period of two years
and 256 days - Even adde
another three years to 22nd
March 1888 the period w
not run beyond March
1891. The suit was not
filed till 28th January
1892 and it is therefore
clearly barred. ~~dismissed~~
~~with costs.~~ Even wh
the first petition was fil
in August 1888 his clai
had been barred. This
suit must be dismis

Palgonda
Vahula
Vadiyar

23-7-96

W.M.

There are two petitions
pending in the D.-G.O.
Please ascertain
whether this one
petition of 7-9-96 is
one of them

9-12-96

Pet[n] Brady

Forwarded to the D.-G.O
for ascertaining whether
any pet[n] of appellant
is pending there

19/12/96

The appeal petition
presented to the Deputy
by Venkatappa on the
7th September 1896 (to-
gether with a copy of
the order appealed) is sub-
mitted - An extract
from the Register of pe-
titions heard in person
by the Deputy, containing
the Deputy's order on the
pet[n] is also submitted

12.96.

Proceedings of the Records connected with the Panchayat of Thaipillai-kalli village, Madura Taluk.

Serial Nos 12 & 13 in the file

Petition No 2112 presented by Venkatajia praying for a review of the order of Govt in the above said Panchayat file

One Thirumalai the Registered Panchayatdar of Thaipillaikalli village Madura Taluk, died about the month of August 1907. After his death one Muthayajia (the contestant) a grandson of the deceased was made the Registered Panchayatdar of the village by the order of the then Dy Collr. The deceased Thirumalai left behind him two daughters & a minor son of one of the daughters, viz, the present petr. Of the two daughters the elder one is alive & the younger died leaving a daughter who is also living. The petr first claimed the office in his petn G 23. 8. 08 to the Taluk. On this the Amildar asked him to present himself before the Taluk

but all the documents he said he required to establish his claim. The plff's agent presented himself before the Auditor with a plaint on 6.3.92 when the Auditor took down the plff's statement. On 4.4.92 the plff submitted a plaint to the District Commissioner complaining about the slowness of his case before the Auditor. The Auditor was then requested, vide letter which he did on 15.4.92 stating that the case was finally disposed of in 1876 F. Sa 5.4.92 the Commissioner ordered that the plff should be given an endorsement referring him to ~~file~~ a regular suit. The plff on 20.4.92 brought a regular civil suit before the City Commissioner, who on 28.4.92 referred it to the Auditor ordering him to hear the parties & submit a memorandum of the whole case. The Auditor on 20.5.92 DW 2 & 3. examined the plff & the 2nd counterpetitioner respectively. The 3rd counterpetitioner Jeremiah was also examined on 20.4.92. One Machakacha a witness for the plff was also examined on 3.9.92. On 2.2.93 the plff complainant applied to the District Registrar

This very Franchise Office was
once contested by the Secretary
but this so-called adopted Court
it was then decided in the Year
by Supt. Crichton in 1868
Letter from Asst. Secretary
Letter from Hd entitled, & in the
Correspondence between the Pet
& the Dy Supt on the subject
Vide p. No 21 containg
7 leaves — is important on the
point but Pet was no party
to that proceeding
etc.

7/2

As regards the ground taken, it
is not of much use unless the
boundary (a portion of the Fence
are fully as fenced) is taken to
be acknowledgment of pet's
right by the office by the
C-pet Respondent. Pet has stated
before me that the C-pet
enjoys 3/4 of the Fence
Area land (which however
are fenced as fenced) and thus
fact- pet's ground of
remarks
review

Forwarded for Dy H-O
for Submission to Secretary
of
MM 10/3/97 11/3/97

'2 10

8

This very Chandapur office was once contested by the deceased's brother's so-called adopted son & it was then decided by the then Dy Supt'o Mr Kelsall in 1868 that the complt. was entitled to it. The correspondence between the Asst & the Dy Supt on the subject Vide Pte: No 21 containg 7 pages — is important on the point that pet'r was no party to that proceedg

U/R.

7/2

As regards the 3rd ground taken, it is not of much use unless the boundaries of the Serna lands (which are fully ascertained) to be taken to be acknowledgment of pet'rs right to the office of C-pet'r under the 19 dm'n Act. It is represented that the Pet'r has stated that the C-pet'r enjoys 3/4 of the Serna lands (which however are fully ascertained) and this demolishes pet'r's ground of fact- deprives pet'r's ground of review.

Forwarded to D. H-O for Sub'm to Govt

CL

10/3/97 11/3

1896 (1)

No. 3728

Name of Petitioner, Venkatappa app

Village,

Taluk,

District,

Date of Arzi, 16-5-96

Date of Receipt, 16-5-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Zero

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the decree of the Asst Collr of Kolar &c, in Rev Appeal case No 1 of 95-96, regarding the Shanbhagi of Khaja Kallahally village — Appeal petn and the decree are in English —

Stamp paper Rs 6/-

16/5/96

Stamp office In Time Council case

Sub Asst 24/5/96

Sealed 23

24/5

Original received in Council on 6/6/96

11/8/96

Received in Council on 6/6/96

8/6/96

L. R. 112-95-1.

5. That the Deputy Comm[illegible] erred
- [illegible]ecting the [illegible]claims' appeal
Lower Court on the ground
it was barred by limitation.

For Respondent

(1)

3728 Presented in the Patta Office 16/5/96

To

3728 R
16/5/96

The Secretary,
Revenue and General
Departments
Bangalore.

R.A. 104 of 1895-96.

Revenue Appeal petition No. of 1895-96.

Appellant (Plff) Venkatappa
vs
Respondent (Defdt) Lakshmayya

The Appellant above named begs to appeal against the Appellate decree of the Dist. Court of Kolar in Regular Appeal case No. 1 of 1895-96 on the following grounds:—

1. That the Deputy Commissioner erred in calling upon the Decree to the effect "provided that Hajee Vallabhy is an independent charge."

2. That the Appellant has been found to be entitled to the Office.

3. That the Decree is inconsistent with the rights involved.

4. That the Commissioner in the division of villages or charges is looked after by the Revenue Department which has nothing whatever to do with the rights of parties.

5. That the Deputy Commissioner erred in rejecting the Appellants Appeal on the ground that the Lower Court on the ground that it was barred by limitation.

6.

6 That the Decree appealed against is illegal and would prejudice the rights of the Appellant

For these reasons the Appellant prays that the Decree of the Lower Appellate Court may be directed to be reversed

Bangalore
16th May 1896

L. R. 112-95

(2)

1896

Stamp affixed
in time
Council case
appeal
Subd
AS.
9/6/96
& 5/-
Petitioner call
for record
dated
10/6/96

No. 5890 R.

Name of Petitioner, Subbarayappa
& 3 Others

Village, Bangalore.

Taluk,

District, Kolar.

Date of Arzi, 4th June 1896

Date of Receipt, 4th June 1896

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

This is a 2nd appeal against
the judgment passed by the
Deputy Commissioner Kolar
against the 1st defendant in
Revenue Regular Appeal
Case No. 5/1890/96.

The plaintiff's (1st respdt)
in this suit the Deputy Commr
in case of this judgment
states that the plaintiff
grand-father & the original
plaintiff died in 1867, &
after the said original
plaintiff was & was the

abandonment claim

abandonment claim

Plaintiff's claim to the land in dispute, presented a petition in the Land Office on the 22nd day of December 1885 — and that the case is therefore governed by the Land Regulations, but from the evidence herein, it will be seen that the claim is contrary to the records of the case — and that the suit is barred:—

(1) That the Homestead Act, introduced by the original Plaintiff before the original County Court (original Plaintiff) was in the Province of "Palgrunna" the year expired (March 1867)

(2). That the Plaintiff in his Petition dated 6th January 1885, states that Siimanjpha Plaintiff's natural grandfather, died Thirty-two years after the original year 1867 when the Plaintiff claimed to have been a child of seven years old and the original Plaintiff was until the 6th February 1892 abandoned

(3). That from the facts given in the above-mentioned and B. Exhibits that the Plaintiff's claim was abandoned in February 1885.

(4). That the 3 years from abandonment from February 1885 called — from March from February 1888 — and the case barred by time from said claim been barred.

(5). That the Plaintiff's claim is barred by the Judgment subsisting that the original Plaintiff's claim on the 22nd December 1885 and the pleadings in Limitation allowed the case expired in February 1885.

2. That Siimanjpha daughter of the Mortuary the original Plaintiff — and the Plaintiff's claim under the Plaintiff's Siimanjpha daughter cannot claim any right Land in dispute as Plaintiff's claim by the Regulations of the Province of Kandahar Province the Plaintiff's claim becomes a legal

(253)

(44) legal rights of Ramanna's
property when the lands
was last all her
claims &c

3. That Ramanna objected
Plaintiff's grand-father
and the 4th appellant subbraya
are [illegible] - as subbraya other
that grand-father's enmity
Venkatachalah, Mudla -
Giriappa, and Ramanna's
grand father Ramanna,
were brothers and the
Khanbhoge of the 12 villages
connected with this family,
was in the name of Ramanna
4th appellant's grand-father
but after his death in 1864,
the Khanbhoge of Kalakatur
and 5 other villages was
registered in the name of the
4th appellant - while 4th of the
Khanbhoge Kalasa and 6 other villages,
was in the name of Sanjivaya
the grand-son of Mudla &
Giriappa - and that Khoge
Kallanelli was given
to Ramanna's appellant
Respondent's grand father -
and Venkatrayappah Ramanna's
elder brother.

4. That the Khanbhoge of
Khoge

connected with N. Kallakulla
Pandhoqua, commonly
given to the original res-
pondents. Their contention
both the original and the
appellate courts have
failed to consider. The above
fact.

9. That the original Plaintiff
in Column 2 of his original
plaint, states that his
maternal grand-father
Venna, who was engaging
the entire Kunch of the
Pandhoqua of N. Kallakulla
together with a share in
the Pandhoqua of Varadapuram,
but N. Kallakulla was
not a separate circle under
a separate charge - and it
always stood included with
that of Varadapuram. The Deputy
Commissioner without
entering this fact - regarded
the Mahzellants 1st appeal
with costs - and the same
time confirmed the order
of the original Court - and
thus did injustice to the
appellants. Further it is
apparent from the reasons
given in para XI - that
of the appeal Judgement,
that the Deputy Commissioner
was wrong in not considering

the

(16)

the appellants name as he was doing the duties of ch from the commencement and this fact is noted in the Register thereof in 1864

6. That the said Kimmaliya having done the duties of the Kaudhaya is not known and this the deputy Commr did not consider

7. That in 1867 when Kimmaliya died, the then deputy Commr ordered the registry of the Kaudhaya to be changed from the name of Kimmaliya to the appellants name as he was the next Class ch and the order which was in force for 28 years was now Cancelled by the deputy Commissioner and thus injustice done to the appellant

8. That Kimmaliya Commr cannot be said to be the owner for the dry field which stood inside between him and his elder brother Timmarayappa and his daughter the said Timmarayappa has also a claim by his daughter & consequently all the Kuch Commr

Rangu Kallakulli was registered in the name of the said Ramayya and Ramayya - but as they had no male issue they had only one of the Swamy Daily - and this they divided between themselves - and enjoyed the land of the Swamy (dry and wet) connected with the Kambapa, together with the "Niranies", remained in the enjoyment of the Appellant who is doing all the duties of the Kambapa. Neither Ramayya - nor his elder brother Ramalingayya or their grandfathers, did the duties of the Kambapa or enjoyed the "Niranies" thereon

5. That the Kambapa of K. Kallakulli was in the name of Ramayya for 4 years since 1564, & he died in 1567 - when the Kambapa which was in his name, was allowed to the

2 ✓

ಕಾಗದಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿಟ್ಟು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಂಕಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಬಿಡಿ. ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಹೀಗೆ: ಅಂಥ ಕಾಗದಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿಟ್ಟು ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವು ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ XII ನೇ ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಟ್ಟುಹಾಕಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರ ಮಾತಿನಂತೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಟ್ಟುಹಾಕಿದೆ.

ಈ ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಾರಿಣಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಬಿ.ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರು 4-ನೇ ಸಂಪುಟದ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದವು ಎರಡು. ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತದ್ದು. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತದ್ದು. ಈ ಎರಡು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಾರಿಣಿಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಾಗ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಯಿತು. ಅವುಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

9-3-1896 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಾರಿಣಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ I ನೇ ನಿಯಮ ಅಥವಾ ಬೈಲಾಸ್‌ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದವು ಎರಡು. ಒಂದು ಸದಸ್ಯತ್ವದ ಶುಲ್ಕವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತದ್ದು. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತದ್ದು.

4-6-1896 (ಅಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ)

V

VI

VII

VIII

IX



(Illegible)

(c) (Illegible)

(d) (Illegible)

(e) (Illegible)

II (Illegible)

III (Illegible)

IV (Illegible)

Vol 2091 Rev. 3 Draft (3) 24

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

L.R.112-95-3

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition Registered No. 3728 dated 16-5-96 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkatapp appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar, in Rev. appeal No 1 of 95-96, regarding the Shanbhag of Kaji Kallahally village.

is forwarded, together with its Two enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

Draft

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
8-6-1896

8/6/96

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition Registered No. 3896 dated 4-6-96 received at the Dewan's Office from Subrayappa, ~~Appellant~~, of Varasapur village, Kolar District, appealing against the order of the Dy. Comr, Kolar Dt, in Regular Appeal No. 1 of 95-96 regarding the office and emoluments attached thereto, of the Shanbhag of Khajicallahalli village is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

Subst.
This is a civil appeal. Venkatarayappa Setty has appealed in order to have the decree modified by omitting the provisions. As the views have been called for in Venkatappa's case, the ~~order~~ in accordance with draft issue. J.S. 8/6/96

BANGALORE, 8/6/96 for Chief Secretary.

189

12/6/96

M.G.C.P.E.—25-6-95—1,000

Reserve Appeal 7/6

Gen. 31]

130 Pet. 9503 82 8
JUN. 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

L. R. 112-95-5

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district.

To The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore, Revenue Dept. & General Department

Dated 15th June 96
Despatched 17-6
Received

General No. 4799
No. 1353

Enclosures No. Nil

His appeal memo. in Pet No. 2091 dated 5th instant for admission of proceedings & petition from the Varthapalli appeal against the order in Revenue Appeal No. 9 of 95-96 rejecting the claim of Maji Kariabelli village, Kolar taluk.

As entitled for in the above case the memo of appeal is as per accompanying print of the proceedings connected

Author's Name
18/6/96

Nil
9/6

Case not ripe.
24/6

Necessary citations with the enclosures

Submitted in the file
This is a case to be listed for hearing. Brief of appln Mr Ramaswamy Iyengar across from there.
AS
24/6/96

Read
AS 1/7/96.
Posted 6-7-96
Notices issued
6/7

Pet 9503 82 8

Comuniler sente me excd.

16

Marquis Wyse Jr

to the Lieut Commissioner

Paris this 21st

Dear

L.R. 112-95-6

30

(8)

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

Read:-

(1) Petitions of appeal Nos. 3728/164 and 3890/172 of 1895-96, presented respectively, by Venkatappa of Dodda Holabi and Subrayappa of Narasapur, Malur Taluk, against the decree of the Deputy Commr of Kolar in Revenue appeal case No. 1 of 1895-96, regarding the Shanbhogship of Khaji Kalhalli in the Malur Taluk.

(2) Records received with docket No. 4799/1353 dated 15th June 96, from the Deputy Commr, Kolar District.

—u—

Facts of the case.

One Timmappa was the Shanbhog of Khaji Kalhalli. He died in 1867 without any male issue. His cousin Subrayappa (1st defendant-) was appointed

as Shanbhog on 8th April 1868, 29
and he now holds the office.
Plaintiff Venkatappa, who is
the son of Timmappa's eldest-
daughter, claimed the office
as Timmappa's heir, by a miscellaneous
petition presented on 23rd August-
1888, and was told, on 6th
May 1891, to establish his right
by a regular suit. Thereupon
he instituted a suit on 28th
January 1892. The Assistant-
Commr who tried the case
gave a decree in favour
of the Plaintiff. On appeal,
the Deputy-Commr confirmed
this decision, provided that
Khaji Kalhalli was an
independent-Shanbhogi charge.
The Plaintiff in his appeal
to Govt urges that the proviso
in the decree is illegal. The
1st defendant urges inter alia
that the suit is barred
by

by limitation.

No. 1425 Error Decision of Govt.
P.R. 1896.

J. 6/10-8-96.

The Plaintiff was, by his own admission, born on the 22nd March 1867. He was 21 on the 22nd March 1888 and was prosecuting his claim by a Miscellaneous petition, from 23rd August 1888 to 5th May 1891, or during a period of two years and 256 days. Even adding another three years to the above period up to the 22nd March 1888, the period will not run beyond March 1891. The suit was not filed till 28th January 1892 and it is therefore clearly barred. Even when the first petition was filed in August 1888, his claim

93

had been barred His appeal

and must be dismissed.

6

Re-draft 6-8-96

C 2 93. Secretary.

R 4/8

L The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District with records returned. Sent on 16/9/96
and copy of order granted Sir
to the parties.

S.V.

L.R.112-95-7

(34)

6-8-96

(1)

(35)

L. R. 112-95-B

[86]

L.R. 112-95-9 37

Gen. 31.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 1899
Rel. No. 159
8 SEP. 96
1896
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Ref. Desi

8/9/96

Mg

9/9

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Revenue and General Department.

Dated 5th September 1896

Despatched 7th

Received

General No. 1080

No. 205

Enclosures No.

Subject Proceedings No. 425 R.P. 96 dated 6th August 1896 passed on the petition of Basappa Appa of Kolar Taluk and Lingayya of Narasapura, Kolar Taluk, appealing against the office decree in Revenue Appeal case No. 1 of 1895-96 regarding the Shanbhogship of Kheji Kalkalli in the said Taluk.

With reference to the above

Subject to report.

Ref
16a

The records referred to have been sent herewith to the Dy Commr Kolar vide this office letter dy 6-9-96

7/9/96

Please return the records after perusal

Dy Commr Kolar

8/9

Dy Commr Kolar

Sir, has the Secretary of State
(2.9)

that the records in the case
have not yet been received
at this office and to request
that the same may kindly
be returned.

Respectfully,
Your obt. Servt.
Edw

L.R. 112-95-10 (13) 39

1897

No. 2112.

Name of Petitioner Venkatappa of Doddaballapur

Village Narasapur

Taluk Chintamani

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 7/9/96

Date of Receipt 4/1/97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures 3.

ABSTRACT.

Review application

The Petitioner urges as follows:-

That on his instituting suit before the Principal Sadar Amin's Court, Kolar, for a declaration that his right to the Shanbhaga of Kasaba Narasapur that officer issued decree in his favour; that on the 1st Defendant's appeal the Dy Comm'r confirmed the decision of the lower Court; that on the appeal of the 2nd Defendant

Submitted with reference to the memorandum on the petition 2112 of 96 (please see above).

4/1/97

1) Fair Copy

2) Stamp Certificate

3) Application for review of G.O. No. 1425 dismissing P.P. 1-96 petition as barred by law of limitation.

Petr's chief ground for review is that adverse possession cannot be said to arise as the office have been in his possession lands are and enjoyments. In this plaint of record returned to Petitioner cannot be verified immediate the Secretary with reference to the order of the Dewan

7/1/97

Submitted

6-Decem 97

4-1-98

Office to call for record

11/1/98

Profit

140

Applies to Govt the Commissioner held that the suit was time-barred and dismissed it on that ground; that this decision is detrimental to his claim which was framed beyond doubt.

Add to that in some instances Govt have decided that time of action extends for 3 years after the denial of right and that in his case this concession was not extended to him.

Prays that on the above grounds this appeal may be reconsidered and that the plea of limitation may be set aside on the ground that he has been in the possession and enjoyment of the land awarded at the Settlement office.

Bgm.
7/1/97.

45

ಕ್ಷಮಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸ್ಥಳ: ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು
ದಿನಾಂಕ: 7-4-1967

ಸಹಿ/-

Pet / Encl / F.1-96 (14) 2 V (1093) 41

L. R. 112-95-11

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition Registered No. [illegible] dated [illegible] received at the Dewan's Office from [illegible]

is forwarded, together with its enclosure [illegible]

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,
16th January 1897.

Draft

Extract from the Register of Petitioners heard in person by the Dewan

2/12

Date	Name of petitioner	Subject of petition	Dewans order
7th September 1896	Venkatap pa	Appealing against the Council decision in the Shanbogueship of Kachi-kalkalli Melur Taluk.	I cannot interfer but let me see the order.

22. 12. 96.
RR

42

(15)

43

Gen. 31]

5260
1897 Pet 491

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
Revenue & General Departments.

Dated 25th
Despatched 27th } January 1897
Received

General No. 2807
No. 698

Enclosure No. 4 & 16 Sls

His official Memorandum
No. Pet / 7-1-96 dated 16th Instant
forwarding for submission
of proceedings a petition
from Venkatappa of Dodda
Hollabhi Malur Taluk —
praying for a reconsideration
of his appeal.

In returning the enclosures
received with the above,
has

Petition Branch
29-1-97

Subject matter of P.P. 7-1-96.
relating to the subject
noted in the margin.

With reference to the order on
2112-96. (serial No. 13)

Short precis of the case
& special reference to the
grounds for review should be
appended hereto

30/1/97

44

has the honor to submit 99

herewith as per accompanying

list the entire proceedings

connected with the case.

M Kinsella

For Deputy Commissioner

147

L.R. 112-95-B

P. (16) 23-9-97

By order

Deputy Secretary

11/9/97

ecline to interfere

2 of J.R.A.J.
12/2/98

2/6.S.
14/2/98

In this case the Revenue has already declined to interfere -

2 of V.R.J.
14/2/98

1896. 8.71 of 96.

The above file on the subject is sent up

13/2/98

draft sent in the prescribed form

Now back its records to Board's. This file was closed in September 1897

24/2/95

(1) Dft Endt put up
26/2/98

(2) Dft docketed & Dc.
26/2/98

S. R. 112-95-14

48

46

1898 (17)

No. 2096

Name of Petitioner Venkatappa

Village Doda Hallahi

Taluk Malur

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 18-12-97

Date of Receipt 15-2-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 4

2 of H. H the Maharani Regent C.

ABSTRACT

With reference to Govt: Endt Nos: 3728 & 2112 dt 5-8-96 & 23- respectively regarding the cla of the Shanbhogee hak of the petitioner for Khalchi Kallahli Village in the Malur Taluk, states pra that the entire records ma be sent for & perused & eq table orders passed-

CA 17/2/98

P. 209 (49)

1255

PRISON OF AGRA'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
I.D. No. [illegible]

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES ONLY

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

5

[redacted]

1893.94 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

Two drafts (52)

50

1898

From

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Genl & Rev Depts

(19)

L. R. 112-95-15

To

The Dy Comr
Kolar Dist

Dated 1st ~~February~~ 1898

Despatched 5th March

Received

General No. 8033. P.
P. F No. 1-96

(1084)

Enclosure No.

Has the honour to return the records received with his docket No. 280/698 dated 25th January 1897 relating to the petition of Venkatappa of Dodda Hollabhi Malur Taluk praying for a revision of Govt order in re the Shanbhogi hak of the said village together with a copy of the Endorsement granted to the petitioner rejecting his petition for information

By order

Dft

for Secy

F-2008
98 (3)

No 2112 dy 23-9-97

ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 2096 ಸಿ P. 4

51

Fair draft 53

1-3-98

(1)

H. R. 112-5-98

ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಹಾವೇರಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಹಾನಗಲ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹಾಡಿಕಿಷ್ಕಿಂಧಿ

ಗ್ರಾಮದ ವೀರಪ್ಪಜ್ಜ ಗೆ ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ.

ಕಾರಣ ನಿಮ್ಮಿಂದಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ನೀವು

18-12-97 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರದುಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಶ್ರೀಮ್ಮಹಾರಾಣಿ ರೀಜಂಟರವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರುತವಾಗಿ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳ ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಯಿಂದ, ಸದರೀ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಿರುವದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮ್ಮ ಮಹಾರಾಣಿ ರೀಜಂಟರವರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಿಮಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮೂಲಸ್ವರೂಪಿಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 28 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ

ಸ್ಟ್ 1898 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೊಕ್ತಾಂ

24/1/98

Diff'

By Order,

Secretary.

Two drafts (52)

1898

From

The Secretary to the Govt of Madras Govt Revenue Dept

(19)

L. R. 112-95-15

To

The Dy Comr
Kolar Dist

Dated 1st ~~February~~ March 1898

Despatched

Received

General No. 8032 P

P. D. No. 1-96

(1884)

Enclosure No.

Have the honour to return the + records received with his docket No 2807/698 dated 25th January 1897 relating to the petition of Venkatappa of Dodda Hollabbi Malur Taluk praying for a review of Govt order in re the Kanthiyi hak of the said village together with a copy of the Endorsement granted to the petitioner rejecting his petition for inam

+ 25-5-1897 Pl
1-3-98 Pl

No 212 & 25-9-97

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
By order
Asst Secy

Dft